



## Research and Reference Service

OVERSEAS REACTION TO THE CUBAN SITUATION  
(As of 3:30 p. m.)

R-121-62 (A)

October 24, 1962

This is a research report, not a statement of Agency policy

## SUMMARY

News coverage of the Cuban situation has reached an almost overwhelming quantity in most areas of the world. Editorial and other comment has noticeably increased, and there has been a tendency for opinion to take more definitive stands. There has also been an increasing tendency to proffer compromise solutions as well as to call for peaceful solution at the diplomatic level. Available comment remains minimal from Africa and parts of the Middle East and South Asia. No comment has been reported from Burma or Cambodia.

Western European press comment has tended to show increased concern with the gravity of the situation, to call for caution, to seek possible compromise solutions, and to question the validity of certain U.S. assumptions. A majority of press comment continues to support the U.S., but strong segments of both the British and French press remain critical. The Soviet Union, however, clearly has been the primary target of critical comment.

Expanding comment from Latin America continued to offer strong support for U.S. action even from sources indicating some anxiety over the potential consequences of such action. Some countries are openly planning for more substantial support of the U.S.

Comment from the Middle East and South Asia has moved from fence-sitting to a more definite position. Strong support for the U.S. came only from NATO allies Greece and Turkey. Both Arab press and available Indian press comments have tended to be critical of U.S. action. The presence of missiles in Cuba is not regarded as justifying a blockade by the Arab press. An Indian press comment suggests the U.S. has opened the door for retaliatory Soviet moves.

Although a call for speedy U.N. action in the crisis is the prevalent theme in Far East press comment, strong support continues to typify comment from the Republic of China, South Korea, Thailand and the Philippines. Malayan press comment has been the most critical of U.S. action, and Japanese press opinion remains ambivalent toward the U.S.

Initial African comment has been wholly critical of U.S. action, calling it an effort to "crush Cuba" with implications that Cuban self-determination is being thwarted.

Soviet propaganda continues to reflect an indecisive character. As yet no official public announcement defining the Soviet position has been made. All Bloc propaganda has retained the "sound and fury" approach marked by strong vituperation.

## WESTERN EUROPE

Western European media saw the Cuban situation as the gravest international crisis since World War II with ramifications for the entire world. Generally, the majority of media continued their initial support for the measures taken by President Kennedy, viewing them as inevitable in face of blatant and deceitful Soviet provocation, reasonable in terms of the objectives to be attained and based on crushing evidence which made lesser action unthinkable. Several papers were critical of the Administration for not having acted before Cuba became an international crisis of such magnitude. The validity of the evidence upon which the "quarantine" decisions were based was also questioned in some quarters. A few papers doubted if the US reaction was justified in view of American missile bases in Turkey and elsewhere. Speculation regarding the possibility of war was rampant. Calls for NATO solidarity and a determined stand outweighed, however, urgings that a compromise settlement be sought. It was generally agreed that the USSR, not the US, was the most likely candidate to seek a way out of the impasse and some papers saw the "moderate" Soviet reply as evidence of this.

Support for President Kennedy's policy on Cuba continued in the majority of the West European press. To the original thesis that the Soviet buildup in Cuba had provoked necessary US action were added the arguments that such action was based on "crushing evidence" and directed toward a limited and justifiable objective. Geneva's independent La Suisse stated that "Kennedy has taken a very big risk although the latest information reaching Washington make it unavoidable." Bologna's right-center Il Resto del Carlino referring to Kennedy's earlier warnings about offensive weapons added that "the proof supplied by Kennedy... is crushing." Pro-Socialist Tagblatt, Linz, argued that "if America tolerated the missiles in Cuba, the nation would have to go down on its knees before Soviet aggression. Together with America the whole western world would thus have signed its death warrant." Papers in a number of countries pointed out that

it was not the intent of the quarantine to starve the Cubans out and compared it in this context favorably with the Soviet objectives in blockading Berlin.

Comment critical of the President's decision was diversified. The British left-wing press deemed the quarantine as "unwise" and urged Macmillan to go to Washington and seek a compromise. A number of other papers questioned the evidence upon which the decision was made and derided the American reaction in view of our own missile bases abroad. Influential Le Monde, Paris, caustically remarked that "it is curious to note that the Americans who find it perfectly normal that a state such as Turkey, located on the Soviet border, harbors missile sites that threaten the whole Donetz Basin, deny the USSR the right to conclude similar agreements with Cuba." Liberal Expressen, Stockholm, saw the US action on Cuba as "putting its own power and security interests ahead of declared principles of freedom and independence." Other papers, however, felt that the President had erred in not taking action in Cuba at an earlier date. People's Party Suedost-Tagespost, Graz, expressed the hope that "Washington's red-light for the Kremlin -- the justification of which is recognized by everybody in the free world -- was not switched on too late" and independent Die Presse, Vienna, saw Washington's earlier forbearance and patience with Cuba as "hardly understandable any more." In a similar vein, right-wing Il Tempo, Rome, remarked that the "US has failed to act promptly, has always given in...; now it is faced with an international crisis of the first magnitude." There was also some doubt as to whether the quarantine could be fully enforced.

By and large, the hope that the Soviet Union would back down or a compromise solution found outweighed the fear that a general conflict was inevitable. For many responsible papers this hope was based on NATO solidarity and a determined stand. Le Figaro, Paris, advised that "the duty of the NATO countries is clear. It is by maintaining their solidarity that they can best reduce the dangers." Independent B.Z., Berlin, stated that "we are on the brink of a new war, but it will be prevented if Moscow feels the determination of the entire free world." There were growing suggestions among elite papers that a compromise might be secured if the two superpowers could be induced to take a step back from the abyss of nuclear war. A mutual reduction of advanced missile bases on foreign soil was one of the possible solutions canvassed by such papers as the London Times which stated pointedly "there is just enough similarity in the siting of some of the bases to cause the question to be raised." Le Monde, warned that "the interested capitals would be well advised in the coming hours to seek compromises... rather than to prepare counter-measures."

Many media felt that President Kennedy would not hesitate in carrying out his decisions. Moderate-right Paris-Presse stated that "President Kennedy does not seem to be a candidate for a trip to Munich" and Milan's conservative Corriere della Sera described the President as "severe and resolute." German papers viewed Kennedy's warning against hostile Soviet action in Cuba as an additional guarantee for Berlin.

Media in general felt that it was up to the Soviets to take the next step and hoped that this would be diplomatic rather than military in character.

## LATIN AMERICA

Extensive media coverage continues to reflect strong support of the US action to block the shipping of offensive arms to Cuba. Both official and public support remains widespread, and holds up even among those sectors which are tending to worry about the implications of the action. Concrete support is being offered by some nations.

The US "quarantine" continues to receive extensive coverage in all the media throughout the Hemisphere. Official and public reaction is becoming more specific on particular aspects of the crisis. For example, some apprehension is being expressed over the possible implications of the US action. Nevertheless, expressions of unity in the face of the continental threat are very strong and some Latin American governments have offered military support or other facilities in the joint effort being made to remove the offensive capability from Cuba. Some leftist groups have demonstrated against the US, or, the Hemispheric position.

Argentina has offered support of its navy for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. The Buenos Aires Herald quoted the Foreign Minister's statement that "Argentina is taking a clear definite position in defense of the principles of the Free World, . . . and will stand united with other nations of the Hemisphere in their fight against communism." Correo de la Tarde commented that President Kennedy's speech will "make invaders notice that from now on provocations will no longer be tolerated."

In Guatemala, Prensa Libre carried President Ydigoras' statement that that nation will "align itself with our brothers of America, and its army will occupy appropriate positions" in the present crisis.

The Costa Rican government has placed at the disposition of the United States its port and airport facilities. Diarrio de Costa Rica denounced the "Red aggression" and La Nacion praised the "strong position" the US has taken, adding that "Washington has spoken with the only language which the communist world understands: force." La Republica commented editorially on "the

H  
A

unanimous decision among our peoples to resist the totalitarian invasion [in Cuba]. All nations of the American continent must form a solid block."

In Brazil, the Minister of War implied concrete support may be forthcoming when he said that their armed forces are "united regarding the position of the Brazilian Government in the present international situation."

El Dia (Honduras) carried President Villeda's statement that "firm measures must be taken." The same paper editorialized that "the patience of the United States with the provocations of the Soviet Union has reached its limit. . . . It is no longer possible to refuse the challenge which enslaving communism has thrown at liberty loving and democratic peoples."

The government of Peru, according to news releases, has offered to send its armed forces to aid in the blockade of Cuba.

The Chilean Foreign Office, in an official statement, reiterated that it adds "its cooperation to the cause of American solidarity."

In Colombia, Radio Cadena Nacional reported that Colombian military officials had spoken of "material support" to be offered in the current Cuban crisis.

Apprehension over the possible implications of the US action has been noted in the public reactions. La Nacion of Chile noted the gravity of the menace but stated that Chile would still follow the road "which its tradition and hemispheric solidarity indicate." Similar feelings were noted in the Central American countries and in Venezuela, although strong support of the US and OAS position remains pronounced.

Official and public comments indicated that the "united" efforts of the American nations is contributing to the affinity of their peoples. La Republica of Costa Rica emphasized editorially the "unanimous decision" in the OAS and Argentine press comment included the "united" front approach of the Hemisphere.

Other typical official and media comments supporting the "quarantine" action include the Ceracar Radio announcement of Foreign Minister Falcon Briceño's declaration that "We (Venezuela) are going to assume our responsibilities in accordance with our international obligations." The Santo Domingo Radio

broadcast President Bonelli's declaration that that nation would "participate without reservation in all measures . . . to cope with the threat which today hangs over the free peoples of the world." Rio de Janeiro's Jornal do Comercio characterized President Kennedy's speech as "a virile 'enough is enough' [to Russia], spoken with the courage of great leaders of Democracy." Jornal do Brasil said, "All friends and enemies of the United States must realize that just as the Soviet Union cannot tolerate a militarized Finland, so the US cannot accept the existence of a communist regime, armed to the teeth, 180 kilometers from its shore."

Cuban media have followed the usual propaganda lines, calling upon the peoples of Latin America to respect "self-determination of [other] peoples." Premier Castro, in his speech yesterday, enumerated the past US "military" interventions in Latin America. At no time did he refer to the Soviet promise to support Cuba with rockets in the event of US actions; on the contrary his attitude appeared conciliatory towards the US. He said: "Cuba has always been ready to discuss with the US government . . . [in order to] reduce tension and improve relations." A television commentator in Havana emphasized the Cuban people "are not alone" and made reference to the support of the USSR and the Bloc.

### NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

No indication of panic in the Near East and South Asia is evident, but everyone agreed with President Kennedy that the situation is explosive. Strong support for the U.S. action is available only from NATO allies Greece and Turkey. The Arab press and available Indian comment has tended to be generally critical of the move. Arab media said even the presence of missiles in Cuba did not justify a blockade and they called for the liquidation of all military bases. An Indian editorial suggested that the U.S. move gives the Soviets an excuse for retaliatory action -- a point made earlier by an Athens paper.

#### Arab Near East

Uppermost in the minds of Arabs was the fear that threats and counter-threats might escalate into World War III. The general tone was critical in the Arab press, especially in Syria and Iraq. Bellwether UAR and Lebanese media blamed the entire crisis on the "blocs and military bases" built up since the second World War. The solution offered was liquidation of all bases.

The quarantining of Cuba was not seen as an isolated event by Arab media and the general public but was linked with other alleged symptoms of the East-West struggle, such as the Sino-Indian border dispute and the involvement of the U.S. and Britain in the conflict in Yemen. For a while, in fact, Egyptian newspapers were letting Nasser's mediation offer in the Chinese-Indian dispute share the limelight with the news on the Cuban incident.

Syrian and Iraqi media generally expressed outright criticism of the U.S., and Damascus daily An-Nasr described the quarantine as "a sudden continuation of the brink of war policy" which might lead to nuclear war. The United States should have first resorted to the U.N., said another Damascus paper, and Iraqi media pointed out that the "violation" of the U.N. Charter had come on United Nation's Day.

b5

Some Arab satisfaction was in evidence about the U.S. discomfiture over the presence of a hostile military base so close by. Cairo papers recalled that military bases in Cyprus and Malta as well as blockades had been used against Egypt in 1956. Al-Akhbar (Cairo) noted a TASS report that 12 U.S. experts had arrived in Israel to build a new rocket base there. Generally pro-West L'Orient of Beirut said the Soviets in Cuba were giving the U.S. an idea of how Khrushchev feels about Berlin and U.S. military pacts on Russia's border.

A few Arab papers saw domestic politics in the U.S. move. Kennedy is seeking a pretext to erase the failure he suffered in the first Cuban invasion, said a Beirut paper. Cairo's authoritative Al-Ahram asked: "Does John Kennedy wish to touch off the people's enthusiasm and zest prior to the November elections?... How exorbitant would the price be if in the meantime the whole globe were enveloped by atomic war!"

#### Non-Arab Middle East

Turkish popular reaction was mostly strong and favorable. Some, however, asked: "Why are the Americans so worried? We have lived near the muzzle of a gun for the last 20 years. Americans should get used to it, too." Meanwhile, the Turkish press noted the "alert status" of US forces in Turkey and the public speculated that the Soviets might blockade Turkey in retaliation.

In Greece, daily Vima of Athens (opposition) noted that Kennedy's decision "is not devoid of great dangers." Yet, said Vima, "President Kennedy's decision is less dangerous than if he had attempted overt or masked invasion of Cuba." While pro-Government Akropolis editorialized in favor of the US action, it concluded that the Greek people could not remain at ease by thinking that the "clouds now far away from Greece won't reach us." Opposition Eleftheria, however, struck an optimistic note by saying: "The cold and objective conclusion following developments in Cuba lead to realistic hopes that eventually there will be a peaceful solution to the crisis. Plain people throughout the world have the right to draw courage and hope from the thought that the terrific weapons brandished by the big opponents constitute a threat to both." Ethnikos Kyrix (pro-government), after chiding the US for waiting until both Cuba and Egypt (sic) had fallen under Soviet influence, called upon the free peoples throughout the world to "stand united in an all powerful front and be ready to meet any likelihood."

South Asia

The Hindustan Times termed the blockade an "act of war," and thought the US justification weak, since by analogy "Russia would be justified in going to war against European states which have permitted US missile bases." Since the Russians can veto a Security Council move, the paper said, the US was obviously not counting on the United Nations to settle the Cuban issue. Russian reaction, it was anticipated, would be to mount pressure against the US at such vulnerable points as Berlin or South Vietnam. "By any reckoning," the editorial said, "Mr. Kennedy is imprudent in tearing up his policy of restraint and gambling on Mr. Khrushchev to remain restrained."

The American quarantine, said the Indian Express, presents the world with "another ferocious crisis" which could lead to actions directly threatening Berlin or Cuba that would leave the world not far from nuclear war. The paper saw little support for the US position. "Normal international law is against the Americans," said the commentator, "The American attempt to bring their action under the United Nations Charter is flimsy...The only threat to political independence or territorial integrity now existent in the Caribbean is that posed by the United States to Cuba."

6.5

## FAR EAST

Heavy editorial and straight news coverage continue to typify the Far East with the exception of late-reporting Burma and Cambodia. Strong support, both official and unofficial, continues to typify the reaction of the Republic of China, South Korea, Thailand and the Philippines, with editorial support from Manila lagging behind official approval. A call for speedy UN action in the crisis remains the dominant theme of the majority of comment, however. The Malayan press is most outspoken in its criticism of the U.S. action, followed closely by the ambivalent reactions of Japan's influential neutralist press. Neither the Communist nor pro-government papers of Indonesia have reacted editorially, though most have given the crisis front-page news coverage.

### Coverage

The Cuban crisis has drawn heavy straight news coverage and editorial reactions from all Far East nations except Burma and Cambodia. Editorial reaction to the President's speech, delayed by the time differential, continues to come in from many countries, while straight reporting via radio-TV and press has shifted its emphasis to the latest developments of the situation (e.g. action at the UN and the possibility of a blockade-engendered U.S.-Soviet naval clash).

### Strong Support

Clear-cut, solid approval and support for U.S. policy continues to emanate from South Korea and the Republic of China (Taiwan). Press and government-controlled radio comment from Taiwan agrees that U.S. patience in regard to Cuba had been worn to the breaking point, and continues to urge stronger action upon the U.S. than the "middle-of-the-road" approach adopted by the President. Hanguk Ilbo, a leading Korean daily, obliquely tied Cuba to Berlin by stating that "President Kennedy's resolution on Cuba may also bring about a beneficial 'side effect', as the Russians may get the idea about America's firmness on Berlin as well as Cuba".

55

Prime Minister Sarit of Thailand voiced his country's pledge of support for the U.S. call for UN action in the Cuban crisis and stated that he "approved of the action taken by the U.S. for its self-defense". Similar strong official support was expressed by Philippines' President Macapagal and Speaker of the House of Representatives Pandatun who stated that "any action the U.S. will take to rid herself of that danger [Cuba] is not only justified -- it is long overdue. I am with the United States 100 percent."

Similar support and praise for the Presidential action were voiced by three Manila dailies (Daily Mirror, Philippines Herald, and Evening News), the conservative Tokyo Shimbun, and the conservative Malayan Times of Kuala Lumpur. The latter, however, while terming the President's action "probably inevitable", indicated serious concern for the brinksmanship involved.

#### Desire for UN Action

The desire for speedy UN action continues to represent the strongest theme emanating from the reaction aroused by the Cuban crisis. This desire is voiced strongly by the Manila Times and the Bulletin of the Philippines, which have expressed most serious concern over the current situation, and the neutralist press of Japan and Singapore. Highly influential Asahi of Japan stated its desire that "...the UN Security Council search for clues to bring the situation under control", and opined that "the dispatch of a UN observer team could be considered to clarify the actual circumstances of the matter and ascertain whether there is an actual threat to the U.S. and the other Western hemisphere countries". Komiuri, Japan's number three paper in circulation, similarly called for Security Council action, but added that "...if the UN cannot find a solution, the leaders of the U.S. and Russia must meet without delay...." The influential Straits Times of Kuala Lumpur also opined that the crisis was an issue for the UN which could be discussed by the General Assembly should the Soviet Union exercise its veto in the Security Council.

#### Criticism of U.S. Action

Criticism of the Administration's action continues to typify comment from Malaya and Japan. The conservative Malay Mail of Kuala Lumpur sharply described the President's action as "panic stricken" and "irresponsible", while the Straits Times felt that "Cuba has become at last an American Suez, and Mr. Kennedy an American Eden". The latter went on to express great fears about a confrontation of U.S. and Soviet ships and wondered if the threat to the Americas was so serious that

b6  
b7c

"...Washington must checkmate it at once, even at risk of war, without the blessing first of the O.A.S. and without consultation with America's allies?" This approach of the Straits Times stood in sharp contrast to its editorial of September 13, which somewhat complacently indicated the belief that Washington would have to learn to live with Castro (~~or~~, the U.S. would) and that there would be no nuclear war over Cuba.

A more ambivalent, less sharp-edged criticism is expressed by the neutralist press of Singapore and Japan. Available reports indicate that the neutralist Singapore press has thus far attempted to straddle the issue editorially while concluding that UN action is necessary. The "Big Three" of Japan (Asahi, Mainichi, and Yomiuri) similarly have taken a critical stance toward the U.S. action and the resultant great danger of nuclear war, while at the same time admitting that the U.S. could not ignore the Cuban missile build-up. The tenor of feeling indicates, however, that the U.S. action was too strong for war-conscious Japanese sensitivities.

Communist China: WCHA dissemination of the virtual text of the Soviet Government's statement on the Cuban issue is the only new material noted from Peking. A relatively uninformative People's Daily editorial on the Cuban crisis had been released earlier.

Africa

African radio stations continue their heavy news coverage of the confrontation over Cuba. French coverage is beginning to pick up. With the exception of English-language papers in South Africa, the very scattered media comment available from independent countries is strongly critical of American "effort to crush Cuba." There is one editorial reference to U.S. military bases "ringing the Soviet Union." With one exception, official reaction is lacking.

African radio stations are continuing the very prominent news coverage of developments concerning the crisis over Cuba. Initial press items are available only from South Africa, Morocco and Tunisia. In Morocco, the prominent news play in most papers is drawn from the AFP wire.

Except for two English-language papers in South Africa, the very scattered media comment available is sharply critical of the American "effort to crush Cuba." Radio Ghana, which in September joined with the government-controlled press in a vicious propaganda campaign against the United States, accused the U.S. of "bullying" tactics, charged that the U.S. wants to "crush Cuba," and referred to "U.S. military bases ringing the Soviet Union." Radio Algiers insisted that Cuba is a sovereign nation and that the American military "has never abandoned its plan for the invasion and occupation of Cuba."

In Morocco the leftist, opposition Al-Tahrir accused the U.S. of preparing "new aggression against the revolutionary regime of the Cuban people." An article in the independent and often anti-Western As-Sabah in Tunisia denounced the "economic blockade and policy of starvation" against the Cuban people.

The Prime Minister of the European-dominated government of Rhodesia and Nyasaland termed it "the most serious crisis since World War II" and referred to "the drastic action President Kennedy has been forced to take."

European-owned papers in Kenya editorially questioned the authenticity of the information which the President said lay behind U.S. actions, or the soundness of unilateral initiatives in advance of consultation in the U.N. or the OAS. The Daily Nation, questioning the correctness of the information about offensive missiles and therefore supporting the call for a neutral inspection team, nevertheless stated that if the "American information is correct, then it is impossible to condemn President Kennedy's action, however dangerous the consequences may be."

## SOVIET UNION

For the time being, Soviet propaganda continues to reflect the initial indefinite responses to planned U.S. actions regarding Cuba. There have as yet been no specific public Soviet official commitments or indications of action. Soviet media are, however, mounting a "sound-and-fury campaign which is marked by a high degree of vituperation aimed at the U.S.

Moscow continues to characterize the quarantine as an "act of piracy," and "international brigandage," stressing, at the same time, that U.S. "aggressive" actions may lead to a thermonuclear war. Moscow also continues to ignore the central issue of a massive Soviet involvement in the offensive arming of Cuba as propagandists insist that Cuba's "military" stance is solely for defensive purposes. One brief reference to the U.S. draft resolution in the U.N. calling for removal of offensive weapons from Cuba merely viewed it as "interference" in the internal affairs of a sovereign state and suggested that if President Kennedy wants to secure a stable world peace, the U.S. should agree to the Soviet "proposals" and liquidate its overseas military bases.

Soviet propaganda, calling on the whole world and the U.N., is currently engaged in concealing the real issues behind repeated expressions of concern over the protection of world peace. Its first reaction to our U.N. arguments ridiculed them, rejected them out of hand, and then began to advertise its own pending resolution as the only realistic and proper one.

Routine propaganda warnings and threats are couched in generalities, in tune with Moscow's avoidance of direct threats. An October 24 Pravda editorial, for instance, echoes the Soviet government statement's "stern" warning that "if the aggressors unleash a war, the Soviet Union would then deal the most retaliatory blow." The Party organ concluded by stressing the need for a "sober view of reality [at a time when] the atomic maniacs would like to play with the fate of humanity and civilization."

An interesting sidelight was shed on Soviet propaganda practices in an "appeal" broadcast to the American people. Moscow, which still has not informed the Soviet public of the full particulars of President Kennedy's October 22 speech, presented an "appeal" directly to the American people. Broadcasting to North America

on October 23, Moscow refuted President Kennedy's appraisal of the Cuban situation, characterized the "blockade" as a violation of international law, stressed the USSR's intention to "retaliate with all its power...if aggressive elements precipitate war," "urged" U.S. leaders to display reason and common sense, and suggested "You must stop and think today: What is America headed for?"

### **EUROPEAN SATELLITES**

While Satellite reaction to the President's quarantine address has been voluminous, only the Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian and Hungarian governments have so far reacted officially. Bulgaria and Hungary adopted the reserved and somewhat defensive tone which had earlier characterized Moscow's official response. Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, answered the President's statement with a stream of vituperation and threat.

Following Moscow's policy, no Satellite propaganda medium has informed domestic audiences of the real point of President Kennedy's statement -- the existence of a Soviet military base in Cuba. By the same token, none has yet offered more than moral support to the Cuban government.

**BULGARIA** In its service in English, BTA (Bulgarian Telegraph Agency) transmitted late last night a government statement on President Kennedy's speech on Cuba. In general, the tone of the statement was relatively mild and defensive. As in its previous foreign transmissions, BTA stressed that the Bulgarian people "have always taken and will take" the side of Cuba. But it also studiously avoided mention of previous pledges of "socialist" help and support to Cuba. Following the Soviet Union's lead, BTA announced that the Bulgarian Government has undertaken to raise "the defensive capability of the country and to put its armed forces in a state of battle readiness."

**HUNGARY** After a brief factual report, datelined from Washington, on the President's announcement of measures to cope with the "so-called Cuban crisis," broadcast domestically on October 23, Budapest

U.S.

radio addressed its first comment on the event "to the Arab World" in Arabic. By Communist standards, the brief comment was rather moderate. It said: "It appears that the U.S. President has moved the election campaign from verbal exchanges to a real hell, namely, war."

After thus implying that the dangerous decision was somehow connected with the domestic political struggle, the commentator, again only by implication, showed up the falsehood of the assertion that the Soviets have equipped Cuba with offensive weapons. Not only have the Soviets denied it but the President himself has "said on several occasions that the arms were of a defensive nature and did not threaten the security of the U.S. or the countries of Latin America."

The Hungarian Government statement, disseminated by the MTI in French to Europe, has just become available. Although predictably condemnatory, it goes no further than to call the measures taken by the U.S. "provocative in character" and the U.S. contention of a threat by Cuba "hypocritical." The statement ends with fraternal greetings to the Cuban government and "the heroic Cuban people" and the expression of conviction that "the rapid mobilization of the forces of peace will again succeed in staying the aggressor's hand..."

The Budapest evening paper Esti Hirlap polemized against the President's speech under the headline "U.S. again violates international law" and termed the actions taken "a cold-war interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state" -- a term Hungary consistently uses to describe American initiative against Hungary in the U.N.

The Czechoslovak government has issued a **CZECHOSLOVAKIA** strongly worded statement in which U.S. action in the Cuban crisis was condemned as "the grossest cynical mockery of all principles of humanity... intended to intimidate all nations which strive for the complete liquidation of colonialism." Expressing complete and "unreserved" solidarity with Soviet demands, the Czechoslovak government declared that Cuba's blockade by the United States is "a dangerous blow against world peace and an open preparation for the unleashing of a general conflict." The statement reminded the United States that it "has lost its primacy in the military sphere," expressed a hope that "the U.S. government will realize the danger of playing with

"fire in time" and will "revoke without delay all aggressive and provocative measures against the Cuban Republic."

The Czechoslovak statement did not confirm or deny the existence of the offensive war installation in Cuba and completely ignored the main point of President Kennedy's statement namely, that the chief goal of our policy is to prevent the establishment of the Soviet military base in the Caribbean.

**RUMANIA** Bucharest domestic radio, on October 23, referred to the Cuban situation only with brief news reports on the President's speech, Castro's mobilization order, Linus Pauling's demand for a withdrawal of the blockade order, and a critical comment from the New York Communist newspaper, The Worker. Later in the day it also reported briefly the USSR appeal to all governments. The papers carried the AGERPRESS dispatch on the subject. The central Party organ Scintelia also cited from Western sources evidence of various U.S. "preparations for a new aggressive action against Cuba." The Communist Youth organ, Scintelia Tineretului, declared that the Cuban people have on their side "the mighty socialist camp and all progressive mankind."

**ALBANIA** Only one sentence from a Tirana radio broadcast has so far been quoted in available sources. It said that "Kennedy's speech was full of vulgar attacks on the Soviet Union..." This broadcast, on October 24th, was preceded by a summary of the TASS report and the Cuban mobilization announcement on October 23rd.

**YUGOSLAVIA** Yugoslavia reacted to the Cuban crisis later than other East European Communist countries of Eastern Europe. Its initial reaction was not completely uniform.

Noting that President Kennedy's speech had caused "uneasiness" in the world, Radio Belgrade warned that the blockade of Cuba could lead to war "if one of the sides loses its nerve." It called for consideration of the crisis by the United Nations.

A Zagreb Radio commentary broadcast on the same day and hour as the Belgrade commentary, used much sharper language. It condemned the U.S. government measures against Cuba as "a flagrant violation of international law and the United Nations' Charter" and argued that Cuba is fully entitled to have weapons of her choosing.

President Tito issued an official statement on October 24 in which he said that "the U.S. government with its one-sided decisions has assumed a very grave responsibility." Tito called for settlement of the situation by the United Nations, asked for suspension of the blockade, and cautioned against further measures which would make "the pacification of the situation more difficult."